arXiv:cond-mat/0203443v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 21 Mar 2002

Field distribution and flux-line depinning in the mixed-state of MgB_2 probed by Conduction Electron Spin Resonance

R.R. Urbano,[1] P.G. Pagliuso,[1] C. Rettori,[1] Y. Kopelevich,[1] N.O. Moreno,[2] and J.L. Sarrao[2]
[1] *Instituto de Física "Gleb Wataghin" UNICAMP, 13083-970*
Campinas, SP, Brazil.
[2] *Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, U.S.A.*

(February 1, 2008)

We report the first observation of the internal magnetic-field distribution and flux-line *depinning* in the vortex-state of a type-II superconductor probed by conduction electrons spin resonance (CESR) technique. The CESR measurements were performed in the recently discovered MgB_2 type-II superconductor compound with transition temperature $T_c \simeq 39$ K using microwave sources at 4.1 (S-band) and 9.5 GHz (X-band) corresponding to resonance fields of $H_r \simeq 1455$ and 3390 Oe for $g \simeq 2.00$ in the normal state, respectively. From the distortion of the CESR line in the superconducting state, the field distribution function, $n(H)$, in the vortex-state was inferred, and from the broadening of the line a direct estimate of the standard deviation, $\sigma \sim 14$ Oe, was obtained at ≈ 28 K and ≈ 7 K for S-band and X-band, respectively. Furthermore, our experiments allowed the determination of the flux-line lattice *depinning* temperature for both employed microwave frequencies.

76.30.Pk,71.30.+h,71.27.+a

In the early 70's almost simultaneously three groups reported the observation of electron spin resonance (ESR) of localized magnetic impurities in the mixed-state of type-II intermetallic superconductors. [1–3] The effects caused by the superconducting state on the resonance lineshape, field for resonance (g-value), and resonance linewidth were later discussed in detail by Davidov *et al*. [4] Concurrently, Orbach [5] showed that the gross observed features could be explained in terms of the internal magnetic-field distribution in the Abrikosov vortex-lattice. [6] Following the Lasher's calculations using the Ginzburg-Landau equations [7] and the analysis of the nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) data in Vanadium given by Fite and Redfield, [8,9] Orbach was able to simulate most of the observed features based on the Abrikosov vortex-lattice internal magnetic-field distribution of a type-II superconductor. Although CESR experiments in normal metals were discovered in the early 50's, [10] only in the 80's Vier and Schultz reported the first observation of CESR in the superconducting mixed-state of the Nb type-II superconductor. [11] However, due to the low H_{c2} [$H_{c2}(T = 0) \approx 4$ kOe], strong decrease of the CESR intensity, narrowing effects, relaxation phenomena, and weak pinning in the superconducting state, [12–14] these authors have not observed the effects of the vortex-lattice field distribution in their CESR experiments. Nemes *et al*. [15] reported the observation of the CESR in the superconducting state of K_3C_{60} [$T_c(H = 0) \approx 19$ K, $H_{c2}(T = 0) \approx 25$ T]. Nonetheless, the observed T-dependence of the CESR linewidth below T_c did not allow them to distinguish between the contribution of the field distribution in the vortex-lattice from that of the relaxation processes. [12–14] More recently, Simon *et al*. [16] reported CESR in MgB_2. However, they have observed the vortex-lattice field distribution either, probably, due to the high field/frequency used in their experiments.

In this work we report, the first direct and unambiguous observation of the internal magnetic-field distribution and flux-line *depinning* in a type-II superconductor probed by conduction electrons (*ce*). The standard deviation of the field distribution has been quantitatively estimated from the experiment.

The recent discovery of superconductivity in the binary compound MgB_2 at $T_c \simeq 40$ K [17] and its high upper critical field 20 T $\lesssim H_{c2}^{\parallel,\perp c} \lesssim$ 30 T [18] have attracted much interest and stimulated us to investigate the mixed-state of this type-II superconductor by means of CESR. To probe the vortex-lattice internal magnetic-field distribution by *ce* we have choosen our two lowest available microwave sources to perform the CESR experiments. The S-band ($\nu \approx 4.1$ GHz, $H_r \approx 1455$ Oe for $g = 2.00$ in the normal state) and X-band ($\nu \approx 9.5$ GHz, $H_r \approx 3390$ Oe for $g = 2.00$ in the normal state) is well suited for this purpose, since for $T \ll T_c$ the CESR field, H_r, will be above $H_{c1} \lesssim 500$ Oe and well below the irreversibility field, $H_r \ll H_{irr}^{\parallel,\perp c} < H_{c2}^{\parallel,\perp c}$ (see below) and, therefore, the *ce* will be certainly probing the internal magnetic-field distribution in the vortex-lattice. Besides, at $\nu \approx 9.4$ GHz and $T \gtrsim 40$ K the lowest estimates for the skin depth $\delta \gtrsim 1$ μm [$\delta = \sqrt{\rho/\pi\mu_0\nu}$, and $\rho(T)$ from ref. [20]] is larger than the average size of our fine powder particles (our MgB_2 particle size ranged between 0.5 μm and 1 μm, determined by optical microscopy). These two constrains improve the CESR signal/noise ratio and simplify the analysis of the CESR spectra, since a pure absorption lorentzian line is expected to be observed at all temperatures. [21]

The MgB_2 polycrystalline sample was prepared in

FIG. 2. a) FCC and ZFC X-band CESR spectra at 19.3 K, b) T-dependence of the FCC and ZFC *dc*-magnetic susceptibility of MgB_2 for $H = 10$ Oe, 1455 Oe and 3387 Oe.

FIG. 3. X and S-band T-dependence of the: a) relative CESR intensity, $I(T)/I^n(40\ \mathrm{K})$, b) shift of the resonance field, $H_r(T)$-$H_r^n(40\ \mathrm{K})$, and c) linewidth, $\Delta H_{pp}(T)$, and resistivity, $\rho(T)$, from ref. [20] .

Besides, in these T-intervals, as in the normal state, the lineshape remains lorentzian. These results suggest that: a) for the S and X-bands, the corresponding temperature intervals $35 \lesssim T \lesssim 37$ K and $26 \lesssim T \lesssim 35$ K may be associated with a vortex-*viscous* motion regime that, via a motional narrowing mechanism, may be responsible for the absence of the inhomogeneous line broadening expected from the magnetic-field distribution in a vortex-*pinned* lattice, and b) the *ce* relaxation in the superconducting state of $\mathrm{MgB_2}$ was found to be T-independent, except for a tiny decrease of ΔH_{pp}^s (smaller than our error bars, see Fig. 3c).

However, below ~ 35 K and ~ 26 K for the S and X-band, respectively, the CESR line clearly broadens and distorts revealing the presence of a field distribution that we now attribute to a vortex-*pinning* regime. It is worth

FIG. 4. a) X-band CESR spectra at 15.5 K and 23.0 K. Left-bottom inset: triangular unit cell and Lasher´s NMR lineshape, $n(H)$, for triangular and square vortex-lattices. Solid lines in a) are simulations obtained by the convolution of a lorentzian absorption line of ΔH_{pp}^{n}(40 K) = 18 Oe and H_{r}^{n}(40 K) = 3390 Oe with a Lasher-like distribution. The best distributions, $n(H)$, are shown in the right-side insets. b) T-dependence of $H_r(T)$-H_r^n(40 K) (closed symbols), and $\Delta H_{pp}(T)$-ΔH_{pp}^{n}(40 K) (solid bars). Notice that the solid bars are not "*error bars*". The inset presents the low field superconducting state phase-diagram for MgB$_2$. The crossover line separating vortex-*pinning* and *viscous* regimes $T_p(H)$ extracted from the CESR data and irreversibility line obtained from the *dc*-magnetic susceptibility data(see Fig. 2) are shown.

The left-bottom inset of Fig. 4a shows the theoretical NMR absorption lineshape, $n(H)$, calculated by Lasher, using Ginzburg-Landau equations, [7] due to the internal magnetic-field distribution in a triangular ($(H_S - H_C)/(H_V - H_C) \approx 7\%$) and square ($(H_S - H_C)/(H_V - H_C) \approx 20\%$) Abrikosov vortex-lattice, where the points in space correspond to the maximum, H_V, minimum, H_C, and saddle, H_S (majority lattice points) fields in the unit cell of a triangular lattice. For simplicity we have assumed an Abrikosov vortex-lattice and calculated the derivative of the convolution of a NMR Lasher-like absorption lineshape, $n(H)$, with an absorption lorentzian lineshape to simulate the CESR absorption derivative in the superconducting state. In this simulation we have considered: *i*) for the maximum field, H_V, the value of the resonance field in the normal state, $H_r^n \approx 3390$ Oe, *ii*) a linewidth, $\Delta H_{pp}^{s} \approx \Delta H_{pp}^{n}$(40 K) $\approx$ 18(2) Oe (no relaxation contributions were contemplated [12–14]), and *iii*) two adjustable parameters, H_S and H_C ($< H_S < H_V$) (notice that CESR is an experiment at fixed frequency, therefore, the diamagnetic shift of the line will be always toward higer fields). The results of these convolutions are given in Fig. 4a by the solid lines on the observed spectra. The best simulations for these two spectra were obtained using the distribution function, $n(H)$, shown in the right-side insets of Figure 4a. The reasonable agreement obtained between the data and the simulation indicates that the broadening and distortion of the CESR lines may be accounted for by the magnetic-field distribution in the vortex-lattice state and that relaxation process is not present in the superconducting state of MgB$_2$. According to the results presented in the insets of Fig. 4a the field distribution deviates from that expected for ideal eitheir triangular or square vortex-lattice. We attribute this fact to the vortex-lattice distortions due to the presence of relatively strong vortex pinning effect in our sample.

Figure 4b presents a summary of the most relevant CESR data in the superconducting state of MgB$_2$. The closed symbols give the shift of the resonance field in the superconducting state, $H_r^s(T)$-H_r^n(40 K), and the solid bars represent the "*extra*" broadening of the linewidth in the superconducting state relative to that in the normal state, $\Delta H^s_{pp}(T)$-$\Delta H^n_{pp}(40\text{ K})$ (notice that these solid bars are not "*error bars*"). This "*extra*" broadening may actually be directly associated to the standard deviation, 2σ, of the field distribution. The temperature where the resonance field, $H^s_r(T)$, departures from $H^n_r(40$ K) agrees, within ~ 1 K, with the critical temperature, $T_c(H)$, obtained from the onset of superconductivity in Fig. 2b. The temperature where the $\Delta H^s_{pp}(T)$ exceeds that of the normal state $\Delta H^n_{pp}(40\text{ K})$, defines the vortex-*pinning* temperature, $T_p(H)$. This temperature separates *pinning* and *viscous* vortex motion regime. The microwave field, H_1, induces a screening current which exerts a force on flux-lines $j\Phi_0$ (j is the current density) per unit length tilting the flux-lines in the direction of H_1 ($H_1 \perp H_r$). This force is balanced by *pinning* and *viscous* forces $\alpha_p x + \eta v = j\Phi_0$, [32] where α_p is the *pinning* constant (Labush parameter), x is the vortex displacement, η is the *viscous* drag coefficient (viscosity), and v is the flux line velocity. So, from the equation of motion one gets the vortex resistivity $\rho_v = (\Phi_0 H/\eta)/(1 + i\omega_0/\omega)$ [32], where $\omega_0 = \alpha_p/\eta$, the so-called *depinning* (crossover) frequency, separates the *pinning* ($\omega \ll \omega_0$) and *viscous* flux flow ($\omega \gg \omega_0$) regimes. We estimate the in-plane viscosity coefficient $\eta = \Phi_0\ H^{\|c}_{c2}/\rho_n \approx 10^{-6}$ Ns/m^2, taking $H^{\|c}_{c2} = 2$ T [16] and $\rho_n = 0.4\ \mu\Omega$.cm [20]. From low-T ($T = 6$ K) magnetization hysteresis loop $M(H)$ measurements and using the Bean critical state model applied to a disk-shaped sample, we estimate the critical current density $j_c(T = 6\text{ K}, H = H_r = 3535\text{ Oe}) \approx 10^{11}\text{A/m}^2$ being in a good agreement with previous results [33]. From the equation for the *pinning* force $f_p = j_c\Phi_0 = \alpha_p\xi$ ($\xi = \sqrt{\Phi_0/2\pi H^{\|c}_{c2}}$ is the in-plane coherence length [32]) we estimate $\alpha_p \approx 1.5$ x10^4 N/m^2 , and finally $\omega_0 \approx 1.5$ x10^{10} rad/s ($\nu_0 = \omega_0/2\pi \approx 2$ GHz). Because the obtained value of ν_0 is comparable to the measuring frequency, $\nu = 9.4$ GHz, and $j_c(T)$ decreases with T, it is reasonable to assume the vortex "*depinning*" occurring at $T \geq T_p(\nu)$ and motional narrowing effects may, then, account for the reduction of $\Delta H^s_{pp}(T)$ toward $\Delta H^n_{pp}(T)$. If such an interpretation is correct, $T_p(\nu)$ should be shifted to higher-T by lowering the measuring frequency. This is actually shown by our experiments at 4.1 GHz (see Fig. 4b). On the other hand, for $\nu \gg \nu_0$ no crossover to the *pinning* regime is expected and, therefore, no "*extra*" broadening of the line, $\Delta H^n_{pp}(T)$, would be expected below T_c. The measurements performed in Ref. [16] for $\nu \geq 35$ GHz, which according to our estimation is well above ν_0, revealed at $T = 5$ K a broadening and a splitting of the line that was attributed to the coexistence of CESR in the normal and superconducting state. The dashed line in Fig. 4b is the crossover line which separates *pinning* and *viscous* FLL motion regimes of MgB$_2$ obtained from our CESR experiments. The inset in Fig. 4b presents a low field phase-diagram for the superconducting state of our MgB$_2$ sample extracted from CESR and *dc*-magnetization experiments and summarizes the discussion above.

Finally, it is important to mention that the results presented in this letter and those of Simon *et al.* [16] are somehow complementary, although below T_c none of our spectra showed the CESR corresponding to the normal phase reported in Ref. [16].

In summary, we demonstrate that CESR can be used for direct probing of the inhomogeneous field dristribution in the mixed state of the MgB$_2$. The standard deviation, σ, of the field distribution has been inferred for various temperatures from the "*extra*" broadening of the linewidth. The obtained σ-value of ~ 14 Oe at $T \approx 28$ K and $T \approx 7$ K for S-band and X-band, respectively, is of the order of the values extracted from the analysis of the muon-spin rotation data in high-T$_c$ cuprates. [34] The small value of σ ($0.5 \div 1\%$ of the applied fields) is consistent with the relatively large value of the Ginzburg-Landau parameter $\kappa = \lambda/\xi \sim 10 \div 20$ for MgB$_2$. [19] Besides, the CESR data has allowed to determine "*depinning*" temperature $T_p(H,\ \nu)$ separating vortex-*pinning* and *viscous* vortex motion regimes.

The authors are grateful to Prof. O.F. de Lima for critically reading of the manuscript. This work was supported by FAPESP and CNPq of Brazil.

[1] C. Rettori, D. Davidov, P. Chaiken, and R. Orbach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 437 (1973).

[2] U. Engel, K. Baberschke, G. Koopman, S. Hufner, and M. Wilhem, Solid State Commun. **12**, 977 (1973).

[3] H.E Alekseevski, I.A. Garifullin, B.I. Kochelaev, and E.G. Kharakhashýan, JETP **18**, 323 (1973).

[4] D. Davidov, C. Rettori, and H.M. Kim, Phys. Rev. **B9**, 147 (1974).

[5] R. Orbach, Phys. Letters **47A**, 281 (1974).

[6] A.A. Abrikosov, Soviet Phys. JETP **5**, 1174 (1957).

[7] G. Lasher, quoted in ref. [9]

[8] W. Fite and A.G. Redfield, Phys. Rev. **162**, 358 (1962).

[9] A.G. Redfield, Phys. Rev. **162**, 367 (1962); W. Fite and A.G. Redfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **17**, 381 (1966).

[10] T.W. Griswold, A.F. Kip, and C. Kittel, Phys. Rev. **88**, 88 (1952).

[11] D.C. Vier and S. Schultz, Phys. Letters **98A**, 283 (1983).

[12] K. Maki, Phys. Rev. **B8**, 191 (1973).

[13] C. Tsallis, Phys. Stat. Sol. **79**, 451 (1977).

[14] Y. Yafet, Phys. Letters **98A**, 287 (1983).

[15] N.M. Nemes, J.E. Fischer, G. Baumgartner, L. Forró, T. Fehér, G. Oszlányi, F. Simon, and A. Lánossy, Phys. Rev. **B61**, 7118 (2000).

[16] F. Simon, et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 047002-1 (2001).

[17] J. Nagamutsu, N. Nagakawa, T. Muranaka, Y. Zenitani, and J. Akimitsu, Nature **410**, 63 (2001).

[18] O.F. Lima, R. A. Ribeiro, M.A. Avila, C.A. Cardoso and A.A. Coelho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5974 (2001).

[19] S. Patnaik et. al., Superconductors, Science & Technology, Vol. **14**, No. 6 (June 2001) R315.

[20] P. C. Canfield, D.K. Finnemore, S. L. Bud'ko, J.E. Ostenson, G. Lapertot, C. E. Cunningham, C. Petrovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2423 (2001).

[21] F.J. Dyson, Phys. Rev. **98**, 349 (1955); G. Feher and A.F. Kip, Phys. Rev. **98**, 337 (1955).

[22] S.L. Bud'ko, G.Lapertot, C. Petrovic, C.E. Cunningham, N. Anderson, P.C. Canfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1877 (2001).

[23] J. Kortus, I.I. Mazin, K.D. Belashchenko, V.P. Antropov, and L.L. Boyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4656 (2001).

[24] F. Bouquet, R.A. Fisher, N.E. Phillips, D.G. Hinks, and J.D. Jorgensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 047001-1 (2001).

[25] Y. Wang, T. Plackowski, and A. Junod, Physica C, Vol. 355, 179 (2001).

[26] T. Yildirim et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 037001 (2001).

[27] E. Cappelluti, S. Ciuchi, C. Grimaldi, L. Pietronero, and S. Strassler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 117003 (2002).

[28] R. Osborn, E.A. Goremychkin, A.I. Kolesnikov, and D.G. Hinks, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017005 (2001).

[29] G. Webb, Phys. Rev. **181**, 1127 (1969).

[30] Y. Yafet, in: Solid State Physics Vol. **14**, Eds. F. Seitz and D. Turnbull (Academic Press, N.Y. 1963).

[31] A. Janossy and R. Chicault, Physica C **192**, 399 (1992).

[32] E. H. Brandt, Rep. Prog. Phys., Vol. **58**, 1465 (1995).

[33] C. Buzea and T. Yamashita, Superconductors, Science & Technology, Vol. **14**, No. 11 (2001) R115.

[34] E.H. Brandt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 3213 (1991); J.E. Sonier, Rev. of Modern Phys. **72**, 769 (2000).